



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

112

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,742	12/31/2001	Sushma Shrikant Trivedi	4860.P2691	3350
7590	04/03/2006		EXAMINER	
James C. Scheller BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP Seventh Floor 12400 Wilshire Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026			PAN, DANIEL H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2183	
DATE MAILED: 04/03/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/038,742	TRIVEDI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Daniel Pan	2183	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-71 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-71 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 31 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

Art Unit: 2183

1. Claims 1- 71 remain for examination.
2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-70 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. New references Morton (5,822,606) in view of Chin et al. (5,497,465) have been introduced to show the newly amended feature of the single chipset.
3. However, response to applicant's remark in regard to Beard (5,430,884), which is used to show some features of dependent claims ,will be addressed below to clarify the issue.
4. In the remark, applicant argued that :
5. a) Beard is part of host processor, not as part of chipset that interface (e.g. the north bridge) the host processors and the rest of the components:
6. As to a) above, Morton has been introduced to show the chipset (see action below). Although Beard taught the processors part of the host, it could be implemented in a chip setting. One of ordinary skill in the art should be able recognize the vector and scalar in Beard could be applicable in a chip in general . As to the north bridge, applicant is reminded that unclaimed features cannot be used to overcome the prior art (e.g. see CCPA In re Lundenberg & Zuschlag, 113, USPQ 530, 534 (1957)). For example, nowhere does applicant claim recite a north bridge.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-4, 10, 12, 13, 19-29, 33, 37-39, 40-45, 49, 53-61, 65, 70, 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morton (5,822,606) in view of Chin et al. (5,497,465).

8. Morton taught an apparatus in an integrated circuit (IC) of a data processing system (see fig.1), comprising:

- a) a chip interconnect (see buses 117, 108, 128, 109 in the chip);
- b) a memory controller (see memory interface 101) for controlling the host memory comprising DRAM memory (see how memory interface configured to operate on high speed DRAMs in col.10, lines 30-17), the memory controller [101] coupled to the chip interconnect (see 101 at the input port in fig.1);
- c) a scalar processing unit (107) coupled to the chip interconnect, the scalar processing unit being capable of executing instructions to perform scalar data processing';
- d) a vector processing unit (see 110-113, see also fig.10 for detailed structure of vector processor ) coupled to the chip interconnect, the vector processing unit being capable of executing instructions to perform vector data processing; and
- an input and output (I/O) interface (see Parallel I/O with connected buffer ports and the buses ) coupled to the chip interconnect, the V0 interface receiving/transmitting data

Art Unit: 2183

from/to the scalar and/or vector processing units a wherein the chip interconnect (SEE THE BUSES) the memory controller [101] the scalar processing unit [107] the vector processing units [110-113] and the I/O interface [I/O] are implemented within the IC which is a single chipset (see fig.1, see the single DSP chip in col.9, lines 28-56).

9. Morton did not specifically teach the single chipset was interfacing a host as claimed . However, Chin disclosed a system including a vector and scalar processing interfacing with a host (see fig.1, host 24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Chin in Morton for including the host as claimed because the use of Chin could provide Morton the ability to expand the communicate path of the vector and scalar processors, therefore, increasing the system processing capability and the connectivity, and it could be readily achieved by redefining the host of Chin into the configuration file of Morton with modified control parameter, such as the read/write port of the host so that the host Chin could be recognized by Morton, and because Morton also taught an external memory interfaced with the chip set for receive fast speed transfer (see col.9, lines 60-64, col.10, lines 30-17), which was a suggestion of the need for adapting to a fast external device such as host processor, or the like, in order to increase the processing efficiency, and therefore, provided a motivation.

10. As to claims 24, 40, 56, Morton also taught :

a) receiving data stream from an input/output (IO) interface coupled to the chip interconnect (see the I/O data in col.10, lines 60-67, col.col.11, lines 1-24, lines 25-59);

Art Unit: 2183

- b) examining data of the data stream to determine whether the data requires scalar data processing or vector data processing (see instruction to specify the scalar processing and vector processing in col.18, lines 1-12, see also the crossbar switch in col.22, lines 31-60);
- c) performing scalar data processing on the data in the IC, if the data ' requires scalar data processing (see col.22, lines 52-55); and
- d) performing vector data processing on the data in the IC, if the data required vector data processing wherein receiving the data streams examining the data (see col.22, lines 42-47, lines 23, lines 7-14) .

11. Morton did not specifically teach the single chipset was interfacing a host as claimed . However, Chin disclosed a system including a vector and scalar processing interfacing with a host (see fig.1, host 24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Chin in Morton for including the host as claimed. The reasons of obviousness have been given in paragraph # 5 , therefore, it will not be repeated herein.

12. As to claims 2, 27,28, 43, 44, 57, 58, 59, 60, Morton also included the switch mechanism for receiving or dispatching the data streams (see the crossbar for transmitting and receiving data in col.22, lines 31-67, col.23, lines 1-19, see the reading of the data cache and the crossbar in col.23, lines 20-64).

13. AS to claims 3, 4, 25, 26, 41, 42, Morton also included processing instructions in multiple scalar units and multiple vector units simultaneously , and one of a kind (see the parallel chips in col.13, lines 50-67).
14. AS to claim 10, Morton also included VLIW (see col.2,lines 38-40).
15. As to claims 12,13, 33, 49, 65, Morton also included shift unit , the integer and floating point (see the shift instructions in col.20, lines 51-56, cool.35, lines 50-60, see the integer in col.40, lines 1-2, see floating point in col.2, lines 25-29 ).
16. As to claims 19,37, 53, 59, Morton also included asynchronous data processing (see col.6, lines 50-55).
17. AS to claims 20, 38,54, 70, Morton also included interrupt processing (see interrupt controller in col.9, lines 60-65).
18. As to claims 21, 39, 55, 71, Morton did not explicitly show the memory mapped addresses as claimed. However, Morton in the same patent taught interface with external memory with DMA (see col.9, lines 60-67), and since the difference in size with the external memory , it must have a memory mapped space in order to perform the DMA operation.
19. As to claim 22, Morton's IC was a coprocessor (see DSP chip).
20. AS to claim 23, Morton also included a special propose file (see the real time applications in col.6, lines 64-65).
21. As to claims 29,45, 61, Morton also included encoding instruction (see decoder in col.13, lines 20-22, see also instruction decoder in col.17, lines 40-53).

Art Unit: 2183

22. Claims 5-9, 11, 30-32, 46, 47, 48, 62, 63,64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morton (5,822,606) in view of Chin et al. (5,497,465) as applied to claims 1-4 ,24,40, 56 above, and further in view of Beard (5,430,884) .

23. As to claims 5,30,46,62, Morton also included :

- a) general purpose registers (see scalar registers in fig.6. 604);
- b) vector registers (see vector registers in fig.10).

Morton nor Chin specifically showed the load and store unit as claimed,. However Beard taught a load and store unit (LSU), the LSU being capable of executing instructions to load and store scalar data from and to the GPR, and the LSU being capable of executing instructions to load and store vector data from and to the VR (see f1g.17, load request and store request, see also col.30, lines 65-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Beard in Morton for including the load and store unit as claimed because the use of Beard could provide Morton the capability to load and store data in the memory cache in response to a predetermined read/write command, such as load an or store, therefore, provide the access of the memory based on specific command defined by sty tem.

24. As to claims 6, 31, 47, 63, Beard taught loads and stores data from and to the memory

location (see memory location in fig.17).

25. As to claims 7, 32,48,64, Morton also included a DMA (see DMA controller in col.12 lines 40-57).

26. As to claim 8, Morton also included 8 bit and 16 bit (see col.12, lines 40-57).

Beard also included bit length up to 32 (see col.7, lines 60-65).

27. As to claim 9, Beard also included dispatch unit (see instructions dispatch in col.29, lines 57-60).

28. As to claim 11, neither Morton nor Chin specifically showed the branch unit as claimed. However, Beard taught a branch unit, wherein the program counter and the branch unit determine the location to fetch next instructions (see fig.1 branch unit). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Beard in Morton for including the branch unit as claimed because the use of Beard could provide Morton the ability to process the instructions out of a normal sequence, thereby increasing the look ahead execution control of the instructions , and one ordinary skill in the art should be able to recognize the teaching of parallel instructions processing in Morton would have suggested the use of out-of sequence processing , such as a branch in order to increasing the processing efficiency, and for doing provided a motivation.

29. Claims 14-18, 34-36, 50-52 , 66-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morton (5,822,606) in view of Chin et al. (5,497,465) as applied to claim 1,24, 40 ,56, and further in view of Dowling (6,597,745).

Art Unit: 2183

30. As to claims 14,34, 50,66, Morton did not specifically show the vector permutation, or the complex integer as claimed. However, Dowling taught system including a vector permutation (see col.13, lines 55-62) and complex integer (see complex integer in col.4, lines 1-8 ). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Dowling in Morton for including the vector permutation and complex integer as claimed because the use of Dowling could provide Morton the ability to accept more complex data calculation (e.g. vector permuting and integer addition with multiply etc.), thereby expanding the processing capability of Morton, and because Morton did disclose a multiplicity of add , shit and logical operations (see col.35, lines 10-60), which was a suggestion of the need for including the a more complex arithmetic operations, such as vector permutation complex integer, for reducing the latency I the parallel processing.

31. As to claims 15, Morton also included vector floating point (see floating pint in col.2,lines 38-40).

32. As to claims 16, 35,51,67, Morton also included lookup table (see col.31, lines 5-14).

33. As to claims 17, 36, 52, 68, Morton also included DMA (see DMA in col.10, lines 51-67

34. As to claim18, Morton also included SRAM (see col.11, lines 25-27).

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2183

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dan Pan whose telephone number is 703 305 9696, or the new number 571 272 4172. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chan, can be reached on 703 305 9712, or the new number 571 272 4162. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703 306 5404.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Art Unit: 2183

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

## **21 Century Strategic Plan**

DANIEL H. PAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1103

